

## REMARKS

### I. Introduction

In response to the Office Action dated November 16, 2007, claims 2-6, 8, 10-14, 16, 18, 23 and 24 have been amended. Claims 1-24 remain in the application. Re-examination and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is requested.

### II. Allowable Subject Matter

In paragraph (17), claims 1-4, 6-17, and 19-22 are allowed.

In paragraph (18), the Office Action indicates that the subject matter of claims 5, 18, and 23-24 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. As described below, the Applicant has amended claims 5, 18, and 23-24 in response to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and believe the claims are now in condition for allowance.

### III. Prior Art from Related Cases

According to MPEP §§2001.06(c) and 609.02, the Examiner will consider prior art cited in earlier continuation applications, and must indicate in the first Office Action whether the prior art cited in the related earlier application has been reviewed.

The Applicants note that this application is a continuation of one or more parent or sibling applications. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate that a review of the related cases has been undertaken and the prior art cited and arguments made in those applications has been considered.

### IV. Claim Amendments

Applicants' attorney has made amendments to the claims as indicated above. These amendments were made solely for the purpose of clarifying the language of the claims, and were not required for purposes of patentability.

V. Non-Art Rejection

In paragraph (12), the Office Action rejected claims 5, 18, and 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. The Applicants have amended the claims accordingly.

VI. Office Action Objections

In paragraphs (4)-(11), the Office Action objects to claims 2, 4, 8, 10, 12, 13 and 16 because of a number of informalities. The Applicants thank the Examiner for noting these errors and have amended the specification in response to these objections, making the suggested changes as well as others.


In paragraph (3), the Office Action objects to the drawings as failing to illustrate the "inner decoder communicatively coupled to the synchronization module" and the "inner decoder communicatively coupled between the inner encoder and the modulator" of claim 23 and for failing to illustrate the "inner decoder communicatively coupled between the inner decoder and the modulator" of claim 24. The Applicants have amended claims 23 and 24, and believe that FIGs. 15A and 15B now illustrate the claimed subject matter. Should the Examiner disagree, the Applicants ask that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney to further discuss the matter.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters still remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 19, 2008

By:   
Name: George H. Gates  
Reg. No.: 33,500

The DIRECTV Group, Inc.  
RE/R11/A109  
2250 E. Imperial Highway  
P. O. Box 956  
El Segundo CA 90245

Telephone No. (310) 964-4615